

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

In this RCE, Claims 1 and 28 are amended. Claim 6 is canceled and no claims are added. Thus, Claims 1-5, 7-24 and 28 are pending in the application. No new matter is added. Each issue raised in the Final Office Action mailed January 20, 2010 is addressed below.

I. ISSUES RELATING TO PRIOR ART

A. SUMMARY OF CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claims 1-4, 9-10, 12-16, 21, 24, and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Pat. Pub. 2001/0017700 (“Homma”) in view of U.S. Pat. Pub. 2003/0065766 (“Parry”).

Claims 5 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Homma and Parry, and further in view of U.S. Pat. Pub. 2002/0046247 (“Iwase”).

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Homma and Parry, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,725,300 (“Nagasaki”).

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Homma and Parry, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,347,305 (“Watkins”).

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Homma and Parry, and further in view of U.S. Pat. Pub. 2004/0184108 (“Takano”).

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Homma and Parry, and further in view of WO 01/40907 (“Carter”).

Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Homma and Parry, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,347,306 (“Swart”).

B. CLAIMS 1-4, 9-17, 20-22, 24, AND 28 --- 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-4, 9-10, 12-16, 21, 24, and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Homma, in view of Parry. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Current Claim 1 recites the following (emphasis added):

A multifunction peripheral configured to perform the steps of:
requesting first device-related information from a network device over a network, wherein the first device-related information includes meter-reading information;
receiving the first device-related information from the network device over the network;
obtaining multifunction peripheral information, wherein the obtaining multifunction peripheral information includes reading a meter of the multifunction peripheral;
generating a device-related report based at least in part on said first device-related information and based at least in part on the multifunction peripheral information; and
sending said device-related report to a recipient device, wherein the recipient device is separate from both the network device and the multifunction peripheral,
wherein the multifunction peripheral further comprises a hypertext transfer protocol module and wherein the multifunction peripheral is configured to perform the step of sending said device-related report to the recipient device by sending said device-related report to the recipient device via hypertext transfer protocol using the hypertext transfer protocol module.

Current Claim 1 incorporates the subject matter of canceled Claim 6. Independent Claim 28 also incorporates the subject matter of canceled Claim 6.

In the rejection of Claim 6, the Final Office Action at pages 18-19 alleges Nagasaka at column 32 line 64 through column 33 line 10 teaches the claim feature bolded

above. However, the Final Office Action fails to note that each of (1) remote application unit 510 and (2) computer 100 containing public information unit 195 are physically separate from printer 240. See Figure 34, and Figure 21. No embodiment of Nagasaka describes a multifunction peripheral containing a hypertext transfer protocol module--- instead, such functionality is supplied by a computer connected to a printer. Thus even if combinable, the combination of Homma, Parry, and Nagasaka would fail to disclose or suggest a multifunction peripheral that includes **“a hypertext transfer protocol module and wherein the multifunction peripheral is configured to perform the step of sending said device-related report to the recipient device by sending said device-related report to the recipient device via hypertext transfer protocol using the hypertext transfer protocol module,”** as claimed by Applicants.

No combination of one or more of the remaining references {Iwase, Watkins, Takano, Carter, Swart} cures the defects identified with respect to current independent Claims 1 and 28 above. Accordingly, each of these claims is patentable at least for the reasons Claims 1 and 28 are patentable, and Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of all claim rejections.

II. CONCLUSION

The pending claims not discussed so far are dependent claims that depend on an independent claim that is discussed above. Because each of the dependent claims includes the limitations of claims upon which each depends, the dependent claims are patentable for at least those reasons the claims upon which the dependent claims depend are patentable. Removal of the rejections with respect to the dependent claims and allowance

of the dependent claims is respectfully requested. In addition, the dependent claims introduce additional limitations that independently render them patentable. Due to the fundamental difference already identified, a separate discussion of those limitations is not included at this time.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are patentable over the art of record, including the art cited but not applied. Accordingly, allowance of all claims is hereby respectfully solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

A petition for extension of time, to the extent necessary to make this reply timely filed, is hereby made. If applicable, a law firm check for the petition for extension of time fee is enclosed herewith. If any applicable fee is missing or insufficient, throughout the pendency of this application, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any applicable fees and to credit any overpayments to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Dated: April 15, 2010

/Samuel S. Broda #54802/

Samuel S. Broda
Reg. No. 54,802

2055 Gateway Place Suite 550
San Jose, California 95110-1093
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1080
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076